

Page 5

1 communication and the party who originated the
 2 communication.
 3 Also, if a Board Member conducted a site
 4 visit specifically related to the case before
 5 the Board, the Board Member must also disclose
 6 such visit. In either case, the Board Member
 7 must state on the record whether the ex parte
 8 communication and/or site visit will affect the
 9 Board Member's ability to impartially consider
 10 the evidence to be presented regarding the
 11 matter. The Board Member should also state
 12 that his or her decision will be based on
 13 substantial competent evidence and testimony
 14 presented on the record today.
 15 Does any Board Member of the Board have
 16 such a communication and/or site visit to
 17 disclose at this time?
 18 MR. BEHAR: No.
 19 MS. MIRO: No.
 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Item E-2 is a
 21 quasi-judicial item that is on the agenda. Is
 22 there anybody here who will be speaking on Item
 23 E-2? If so, we will ask you to be sworn in.
 24 MR. COLLER: In this case, I believe just
 25 Staff would be the only one to be sworn in for

Page 7

1 had a chance to review those?
 2 MR. BEHAR: I make a motion to approve.
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion.
 4 MR. TORRE: I'll second.
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a second by
 6 Venny.
 7 Any comments?
 8 Call the roll, please.
 9 THE SECRETARY: Claudia Miro?
 10 MS. MIRO: Yes.
 11 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 12 MR. TORRE: Yes.
 13 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
 14 MR. WITHERS: Yes.
 15 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 16 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 17 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 19 The procedure that will be used for
 20 tonight's meeting is as follows: First, we'll
 21 have the identification of the agenda item by
 22 Mr. Coller, presentation by Staff and
 23 presentation by applicant or agent, in this
 24 case Staff is doing the presentation. Then
 25 I'll go ahead and open it for public comment,

Page 6

1 that item, unless there's somebody in the
 2 audience that is going to be testifying on E-2.
 3 (Thereupon, the participant was sworn.)
 4 MR. TRIAS: I do.
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 6 Everyone who speaks this evening must
 7 complete the roster on the podium. We ask that
 8 you print your name clearly, so the official
 9 records of your name and address will be
 10 correct. We also ask, if there's anybody that
 11 wants to speak -- via Zoom, I'll ask any person
 12 wishing to speak on tonight's agenda items, to
 13 please open their chat and send a direct
 14 message to Jill Menendez, stating you would
 15 like to speak before the Board, and include
 16 your full name. Jill will call you when it's
 17 your turn. I'd ask you to be concise, for the
 18 interest of time.
 19 Phone platform participants, after the Zoom
 20 platform participants are done, I will ask
 21 phone participants to comment on tonight agenda
 22 items. I'd also ask you to be concise, for the
 23 interest of time.
 24 Next we have the approval of the minutes of
 25 the February 9th, 2022 meeting. Has everybody

Page 8

1 first in Chamber, then Zoom platform, and then
 2 the phone line platform. Afterwards, we'll
 3 close the public comment, have Board
 4 discussion, a motion, further discussion, and a
 5 second of the motion, and then Board's final
 6 comments and a vote, if necessary. Thank you.
 7 Mr. Coller.
 8 MR. COLLER: Item E-1 and E-2 are related,
 9 so I'm going to read both in.
 10 Item E-1, an Ordinance of the City
 11 Commission granting approval of proposed
 12 amendments to the text of the City of Coral
 13 Gables Comprehensive Plan, pursuant to
 14 expedited state review procedures, and Zoning
 15 Code Article 14, "Process," Section 14-213,
 16 "Comprehensive Plan Text and Map Amendments;"
 17 to provide that the maximum number of floors in
 18 the Comprehensive Plan shall not apply to any
 19 Planned Area Development upon City Commission
 20 approval, and to allow an additional height
 21 bonus in return for limiting density for
 22 qualifying Planned Area Developments within the
 23 Central Business District; providing for a
 24 severability clause, repealer provision, and
 25 providing for an effective date.

1 Item E-2, an Ordinance of the City
 2 Commission providing for text amendments to the
 3 City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code,
 4 Article 2, "Zoning Districts," Section 2-500
 5 "Planned Area Development," (PAD) to provide
 6 that upon City Commission approval, the maximum
 7 number of stories in any PAD shall not apply;
 8 and to create a "Height Bonus to PAD Minimum
 9 Development Standards in the Central Business
 10 District" providing additional height with a
 11 limit of density for qualifying properties upon
 12 City Commission approval, providing for
 13 severability clause, repealer provision,
 14 codification, and providing for an effective
 15 date.
 16 Items E-1, E-2, public hearing.
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you.
 18 Mr. Trias.
 19 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Chairman, you have seen
 20 these items before and you voted on them.
 21 However, it's necessary to have a vote for or
 22 against -- the last vote was two-two -- in
 23 order to forward the Comprehensive Plan
 24 Amendment to the State. So that's why it's
 25 here before you again. If you have any

1 questions, I'll be happy to help, but nothing
 2 has changed as far as the content of the
 3 request.
 4 A little bit extra height to 205 feet, in
 5 certain areas of the Downtown, with a limit of
 6 100 acres (sic) of density.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Any other --
 8 MR. TRIAS: That's it. I'm done. I think
 9 most of you are familiar with it, so I don't
 10 want to -- but if you have any questions, I'll
 11 be happy to answer them.
 12 MR. BEHAR: I do have a question.
 13 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, please.
 14 MR. BEHAR: I don't agree with -- and I
 15 think -- I wasn't here the last time this came
 16 up, but I saw it on TV. I don't agree that we
 17 should be limiting the density in the CBD
 18 area -- on the contrary, that's where you want
 19 the density -- to a minimum.
 20 What I think this is doing is, it's seeking
 21 that if you give the caveat of a hundred units
 22 per acre, you could go up to 205 feet, 6
 23 inches, right?
 24 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Sir.
 25 MR. BEHAR: It says, "Current number of

1 stories," you're at 14, 16 -- 14 with Med I, 16
 2 stories with Mediterranean Level II bonus.
 3 This will have no limit on the number of
 4 stories.
 5 MR. TRIAS: For a PAD.
 6 MR. BEHAR: For a PAD.
 7 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. So there's a few moving
 8 parts here. One of them is, this does not
 9 affect the current regulations. If you are not
 10 taking advantage of this, you can still do
 11 unlimited density, within the rules. Clearly,
 12 there's a limit eventually. But the second
 13 issue is that it only applies to PADs.
 14 MR. WITHERS: Wait. Say that again. What
 15 did you say about height?
 16 MR. BEHAR: If you are doing a PAD in which
 17 you're limiting it to a hundred units per acre,
 18 you could go up, from 190 feet 6 inches, to 205
 19 feet 6 inches. You get an extra 15 feet.
 20 MR. WITHERS: To the roof -- to the roof
 21 line, not to the --
 22 MR. BEHAR: Not to the architectural
 23 treatment or whatever.
 24 MR. TRIAS: Correct. Correct.
 25 MR. BEHAR: To the roof deck.

1 MR. WITHERS: Okay.
 2 MR. BEHAR: Okay. So, essentially, you're
 3 getting 15 feet more.
 4 MR. WITHERS: But I thought the argument
 5 for that was higher ceilings and grandeur
 6 spaces and higher retail -- two-story retail on
 7 the bottom and things like that. We talked
 8 about more pedestrian amenities in exchange for
 9 that. I think that was your thoughts on it,
 10 wasn't it?
 11 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. I mean, you're going to
 12 get -- you've got no limits. What I'm -- I'm
 13 okay going to 100 and -- I mean, going to 205
 14 feet. What about if somebody comes in and
 15 says, I want to do 19 stories now?
 16 MR. TRIAS: That's something that somebody
 17 could do. But in addition, in the update that
 18 we had recently, there was a minimum height for
 19 the ground level. So there are some other
 20 limits.
 21 MR. BEHAR: But if you do currently -- in
 22 190, you could do 17 stories at 10 feet, that's
 23 170.
 24 MR. TRIAS: Sure.
 25 MR. BEHAR: And you don't need it so much

Page 13

1 for the parking. And then you could do 20 feet
 2 for the ground floor, right?
 3 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 4 MR. BEHAR: What I think this is doing is
 5 opening up the possibility to go for an extra
 6 story, 19 stories.
 7 MR. TRIAS: The other issue is that it's a
 8 PAD, so it's discretionary, it's reviewed. The
 9 Commission may say, yes; may say, no; so it's
 10 not by right, by any means.
 11 MR. TORRE: But what really matters is the
 12 FAR. Truly, the impact of a property, a
 13 project, is really because of the FAR. The
 14 heights are not so impactable. The FAR is
 15 what's here. The FAR is not being challenged
 16 or changed by this. Basically, one particular
 17 project could be 300,000 feet.
 18 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 19 MR. TORRE: To massage the size of the
 20 units, you're reducing it, leaves the square
 21 footage to go towards the office side. You're
 22 shrinking the density. You're shrinking the
 23 amount of units. You're not shrinking the FAR.
 24 In a sense, what you're doing is, you're
 25 creating more of an impact from the Commercial

Page 15

1 I'm prepared to vote for this to go
 2 forward. I don't think that the impact of this
 3 change is going to make any real impact. You
 4 have to have one acre, in the middle of
 5 Downtown, to do a PAD. I think that the
 6 overall impact is not going to be in any way,
 7 shape or form impactable for us.
 8 And, again, big units would be great. They
 9 rent for more money. Economies change, and,
 10 then, when you have three or four thousand
 11 square feet, they sell for a lot more money.
 12 Now, that may be good in an economy, but it may
 13 not be good in another economy. So it doesn't
 14 matter. These things may happen today, but
 15 five years from now, nobody may want to build
 16 bigger units. So it doesn't, to me, make a big
 17 impact.
 18 I've been against it. I'm prepared to make
 19 this vote go forward. I'd like this project to
 20 go forward and I know this is attached to one
 21 particular project.
 22 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: If I may, what I'd
 23 like to do is recognize that Luis has joined
 24 our meeting, if you could please count him in.
 25 MR. TRIAS: The project is scheduled for

Page 14

1 part of the project than you are from the
 2 Residential part of the project. And I think
 3 the intent, from what I understand it, was
 4 to -- in the guise of the proposal, was to
 5 reduce impact on the streets and traffic, which
 6 I don't believe that's the way I feel it about
 7 it, but that's the objective.
 8 If you take it, and don't reduce the FAR,
 9 and you push it all over towards the
 10 Commercial, in reality, you got people driving
 11 in the morning, driving at five o'clock and
 12 creating that middle day traffic, which is less
 13 impactable -- or, I should say, more impactable
 14 than the morning person that leaves at 7:00 or
 15 8:00 and comes back at 5:00 and then parks her
 16 car. So there's too much of an impact by
 17 shifting towards the Commercial, if the FAR is
 18 not affected.
 19 So I think there was a motion here to help
 20 a project, which I believe is a good project,
 21 so I've been very voiced -- you know, my voice
 22 has been loud, that density in the Downtown
 23 should not be reduced. It's something that I
 24 don't quite believe is the right way of doing
 25 it.

Page 16

1 next week.
 2 MR. BEHAR: Look, and I agree with you. I
 3 think this is a good project going forward, and
 4 I don't have a problem -- and, Chip, going --
 5 if you were to do higher ceilings, okay. I
 6 think that would be -- if you have big units --
 7 bigger units, you want to have higher ceilings.
 8 We're all in favor of that.
 9 I just don't want to see trying, you know,
 10 to circumvent later and say, I want to do low
 11 ceilings to get higher --
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Hire density.
 13 MR. BEHAR: -- higher -- even though -- but
 14 this only limits it to a hundred units per
 15 acre, right. You can never do that. Look, I
 16 answered my own question.
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: What I'd like to do,
 18 let's go ahead and open it to the public. Is
 19 there anybody here that would like to speak on
 20 Items E-1 or E-2?
 21 Jill, do we have anybody on Zoom?
 22 THE SECRETARY: Yes, we do.
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: How many speakers?
 24 THE SECRETARY: One.
 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Go ahead, please.

1 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Gillis?
 2 MR. GILLIS: Hello, my name is Brett
 3 Gillis, and I'm calling because -- yes. Can
 4 you hear me?
 5 THE SECRETARY: Can you please state your name?
 6 MR. GILLIS: My name is Brett Gillis.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: With your address,
 8 please.
 9 MR. GILLIS: 915 Ferdinand Street, Coral
 10 Gables.
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you. Go ahead,
 12 please.
 13 MR. GILLIS: Okay. Hello, everybody. I'm
 14 calling, because I have a question for Staff,
 15 because we're talking about how it seems like,
 16 you know, you're talking about the properties
 17 that are increasing from the Commercial
 18 High-Rise, that it could go up to 205.5 feet,
 19 but it looks like, within the Central Business
 20 District, there are properties that are still
 21 Zoned Low and Mid-Rise. So that's only 50 or
 22 70 feet. So I wanted to know how this would
 23 impact those properties, especially in the area
 24 bordering the Crafts Section.
 25 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We'll go ahead and ask

1 those questions to Staff.
 2 Do you have any other comments based on E-1
 3 or E-2?
 4 MR. GILLIS: Mainly not a question, but my
 5 comment, just from a philosophical standpoint
 6 would be that we've just had a Zoning Code
 7 re-write or update that was supposed to resolve
 8 a lot of these Zoning issues, and it seems like
 9 every month the agendas keep getting bigger,
 10 with more amendments and more proposals. So
 11 I'd also like Staff to address that, why, after
 12 the Zoning update that was supposed to resolve
 13 these issues, why are we still having these
 14 cases come up and tailoring the Zoning Code to
 15 it, after we've had a complete overhaul that we
 16 paid a consultant a tremendous amount of money.
 17 Thank you.
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Thank you, sir.
 19 MR. TRIAS: This was an idea proposed by
 20 the City Commission, discussed by the City
 21 Commission. It was approved by the City
 22 Commission. This is something that happened
 23 after the update. So that is normal. That
 24 happens all of the time. I mean, people come
 25 up with new ideas and that's the way the

1 project -- the Zoning Codes evolve.
 2 As far as the Zoning and the Land Use, it
 3 has -- obviously, the Land Use has to allow for
 4 this, and if it doesn't, then it doesn't, and
 5 what happens is that this is for a very
 6 specific area in the Central Business District,
 7 for very Specific Conditions, for a PAD, which
 8 has to be an acre, and the idea is that the
 9 limited density could be seen as a benefit for
 10 development in that area. That is what the
 11 Commission believes.
 12 MR. WITHERS: When you say, "Limited
 13 density," you mean that instead of having three
 14 two-bedroom apartments, where there's six cars,
 15 you have one six-bedroom apartment, with two
 16 cars? Is that what you mean by limited
 17 density?
 18 MR. TRIAS: That's one way to look at it,
 19 yes.
 20 MR. WITHERS: No, I mean, was that the
 21 intent of the Commission? I mean --
 22 MR. TRIAS: That's the way I understand it,
 23 yes.
 24 MR. WITHERS: So the FAR is not changing.
 25 MR. TRIAS: The number of units is what's

1 used to quantify the impact usually, in terms
 2 of traffic, trips, in terms of parking, et
 3 cetera. So, less units, in theory, will be
 4 less impact. In fact, that's the thinking,
 5 yeah.
 6 MR. WITHERS: Right. That's the --
 7 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 8 MR. TORRE: My point is, if the units make
 9 up too much square feet, bigger units, smaller
 10 units, all of that goes to the Commercial.
 11 It's not changing the total map.
 12 MR. WITHERS: Correct.
 13 MR. BEHAR: I mean, technically you're
 14 right. You could do a hundred units, okay, and
 15 you could do 100,000 square feet of office,
 16 right?
 17 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. You could have TDRs and
 18 get to 4.375, and your scenario is realistic,
 19 yes.
 20 MR. BEHAR: And you're not going to
 21 decrease the intensity of that project. On the
 22 contrary, you're going to increase it.
 23 In theory, it's good, because you're
 24 reducing density in that area.
 25 MR. TRIAS: Just like anything, and this is

1 not a theoretical exercise, you are going to
2 get a project, based on that, next week, so
3 there's a way to test some of these ideas and
4 to see what -- if one of the intents could be,
5 and I think, in that case, in that project, the
6 idea was to do large units. So the number of
7 units was not the issue. The FAR will remain
8 large, but the number of units was decreased,
9 compared to some other Downtown projects.

10 MR. TORRE: The project, I feel, is fine,
11 and I think, the height issue, to me, doesn't
12 become a real issue. It's what's given as an
13 incentive and a trade.

14 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.

15 MR. TORRE: So the trade here, I think you
16 have it in your paperwork, is four or five
17 things that have to be provided for to get the
18 approval.

19 MR. TRIAS: There's additional green space
20 at the ground level, Med Bonus, and the 100
21 units per acre cap. I think that's basically
22 it.

23 MR. TORRE: Right. And I think that what I
24 would prefer, and, again, that's a proposal and
25 I disagree with it, that's fine, is that we

1 focus on the quality of what's on the ground
2 floor, that we provide for very interesting
3 places to walk by, places that are active, and
4 that should be more the incentive. And the
5 quality of what you see and touch on the ground
6 floor could be a real good incentive. It could
7 be product, it could just be other things.
8 That's just a different way of looking at it,
9 but, again, that's just the way I perceive it.

10 MR. TRIAS: And I think that, in Coral
11 Gables, in particular, most of the projects do
12 such a good job at the ground level that we
13 take it for granted, almost, that that stuff is
14 going to happen. You'll see what this project
15 is doing --

16 MR. TORRE: No. No. But here's where this
17 is going. So we're doing a lot of projects
18 that are a full block.

19 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

20 MR. TORRE: They just tend to be that way,
21 because the incentive is to do big projects.
22 Economically speaking, that's what's driving
23 the developments and so is our Code, it
24 incentivizes 200 feet plus, plus.

25 When you do that, the blocks become very

1 hard to make them as interesting as the smaller
2 parcels that we're knocking down, that are
3 interesting because you walk by an attorney,
4 you walk by different things. Here you have
5 one person creating a streetscape from end to
6 end, that has control of what that looks like,
7 and, again, it could be blank walls, it could
8 be -- I passed by Mercedes Benz, not that
9 that's a good example, but you wouldn't want to
10 be very bored walking past Mercedes Benz,
11 because there's nothing to look at. It's a
12 peril. It's a bad example. But the incentive
13 could be to have active, interesting ways to
14 walk down the CBD.

15 And it's not because of anybody else, this
16 is the Central Business District, that it
17 should be interesting to walk past the first
18 block or the second block, so Aragon or
19 Andalusia or Sevilla. It should be interesting
20 blocks, if you could make them so, versus not,
21 if you could make them so.

22 MR. TRIAS: We try. We try really hard.

23 MR. TORRE: Exactly. And that's all I'm
24 saying, is that that would be a great incentive
25 to try to continue to have that feeling of it's

1 interesting.

2 MR. TRIAS: The issue is whether or not the
3 Zoning Code is the right tool to do those
4 things, and in my view, the Zoning Code is very
5 limited in what it can do in terms of quality.
6 On the other hand, the review by the Board of
7 Architects or even the review of Staff, which
8 apparently no one takes into account anymore,
9 that really allows the projects to implement
10 the things that you're talking about. It's
11 about design, and design is a different set of
12 scales than what you find in the Zoning Code,
13 in terms of the Code, as you well know. I
14 mean, I'm not saying something new.

15 MR. TORRE: But here's the thing, when you
16 did the Design area, I forget the area that you
17 called -- the Design Innovation area --

18 MR. TRIAS: Innovation and Design District.

19 MR. TORRE: -- there are things you did
20 there to create -- glass had to be lower, you
21 have to have certain things like that, to make
22 sure that those things were being done. It
23 wasn't like -- this is not knew. You actually
24 did it.

25 MR. TRIAS: Certainly we can do more, and

Page 25

1 one of the things that we have been able to do
 2 is implement the minimum height, that is a
 3 little bit higher, for the ground level, which
 4 allows for the higher quality retail. So, I
 5 mean, this can be done, but as you well know,
 6 we went through the update -- you all went
 7 through the update also -- and my goal was to
 8 really create a lot of the tools that will be
 9 useful, and at end we ended up with many
 10 things, but not everything that I think will be
 11 needed.

12 So there's a point in which the process
 13 limits the ability to do many of those things.
 14 So that's just the way it is.

15 MR. TORRE: There's good intentions here
 16 and I appreciate the good intentions, right.
 17 So the project has some great aspects to it.
 18 The height is great and so forth. I think that
 19 the proposal, to give the incentive on density,
 20 is against what I believe -- I believe -- my
 21 personal opinion.

22 MR. TRIAS: And you made that very clear.

23 MR. TORRE: Right, and that's how I'm
 24 judging it. Otherwise, I think the project is
 25 fine and I think that this doesn't really

Page 27

1 massing around, which I thought was one of the
 2 big intentions of having it.

3 MR. TRIAS: And those are probably the best
 4 PADs, the one that have --

5 MR. WITHERS: Yeah, five or six buildings,
 6 yeah.

7 MR. TRIAS: Or twenty buildings.

8 MR. WITHERS: Or twenty, right.

9 MR. TRIAS: You know, yes, I like those.

10 In fact, we had one recently, right, and what
 11 happens is that then there's the one that has
 12 three buildings, like the 2020 Salzedo --

13 MR. WITHERS: Right.

14 MR. TRIAS: -- and then there was that one
 15 building --

16 MR. WITHERS: Like the one we had over just
 17 north of the Youth Center there, that was
 18 probably a pretty good example of it.

19 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And some of them have
 20 been Residential mostly, and some of them have
 21 been large buildings. So that is the nature of
 22 the process. And what happens is that, in this
 23 case, this emphasizes or this leads to larger
 24 buildings. I believe that's true. And that's
 25 something that we all need to consider.

Page 26

1 change a lot.

2 MR. TRIAS: I think that's the role of the
 3 Planning and Zoning, to make those points.

4 MR. TORRE: Yeah.

5 MR. TRIAS: And, equally, the Commission
 6 has made it very clear that this is what they
 7 support.

8 MR. TORRE: Understood.

9 MR. WITHERS: I have a philosophical
 10 question, kind of picking up on what Brett
 11 said. I always thought that a PAD was always,
 12 when you had a site, you had multiple buildings
 13 on it, and you wanted to move massing to one
 14 side of it to make it more accommodating either
 15 for traffic flow or design. So how does a PAD
 16 really work when you only have one building?

17 MR. TRIAS: Well, it --

18 MR. WITHERS: I mean, why don't we just
 19 give a variance? I mean, I'm serious about
 20 that. I mean --

21 MR. TRIAS: What are the public benefits?
 22 Well, the extra open space at the ground level
 23 and the ability -- and maybe the ability to
 24 design --

25 MR. WITHERS: But you're not really moving

Page 28

1 Now, large buildings in the context of
 2 Coral Gables, not in the context of, let's say,
 3 Brickell Avenue.

4 MR. WITHERS: I understand.

5 MR. TRIAS: So, you know, within the rules --

6 MR. WITHERS: So, as a tool, is the PAD a
 7 good use for a single building site?

8 MR. TRIAS: I don't think it's the ideal.
 9 I mean, I think that what happens with a PAD is
 10 that it may give you some breaks, as far as the
 11 setbacks or step backs, which, if done
 12 skillfully, is wonderful, but if it's not done
 13 skillfully, then you have the issue that, okay,
 14 what is the public benefit, in terms of design?

15 That is why we have a process that focuses
 16 only on design, which is the Board of
 17 Architects. If properly applied, I think
 18 that's the best way to address those issues,
 19 but we all need -- it's a team effort. I mean,
 20 everybody has to work on it, and each of the
 21 Boards has a role to play.

22 So what I'm bringing to you is what the
 23 Commission has --

24 MR. WITHERS: I know. I read their
 25 minutes, and I understand.

Page 29

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Jill, do we have any
 2 other speakers?
 3 THE SECRETARY: No, we don't.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. At this time,
 5 let's go ahead and close it for public comment.
 6 Chip, do you want to continue?
 7 MR. WITHERS: I'm done.
 8 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Luis.
 9 MR. REVUELTA: I have a couple of
 10 questions. I'm sorry I was late.
 11 Is this -- Luis Revuelta -- is this 205.5
 12 change specific to this project only or this is
 13 a generic Code change?
 14 MR. TRIAS: It's a generic Code change that
 15 is inspired by an example that will be coming
 16 before you.
 17 MR. REVUELTA: So this is, in essence,
 18 reverse engineering, reverse Zoning. And I
 19 have expressed this before, I have a major
 20 problem when I read a Code and I see a number
 21 that I say, who came up with this number?
 22 Obviously, we know how this number is coming
 23 about, so I don't have a problem with the
 24 project. I think, like Venny, I don't have the
 25 same issue that he has of giving up density for

Page 31

1 building have right now?
 2 MR. TRIAS: The one proposed for next week?
 3 MR. REVUELTA: The one proposed, yeah.
 4 MR. TRIAS: 18.
 5 MR. REVUELTA: 18?
 6 MR. TORRE: The project would have to be
 7 skinny, to go up, to the extent that the mass
 8 has to be --
 9 MR. REVUELTA: And, frankly, I think one of
 10 the things a Zoning Code should do is give some
 11 flexibility to an architect and developer to
 12 come up with a different massing. Like some
 13 guys say, "Well, I want to go 20 stories, but I
 14 want to do a shorter building." That would be
 15 a good thing, I think. As long as the FAR is
 16 not changing, as long as density is not
 17 changing -- density and intensity are not
 18 changing.
 19 I think, to put on the Ordinance, a number,
 20 that to me makes sense, and this one doesn't
 21 make sense, but a number of stories to guard
 22 ourselves from somebody going crazy or not
 23 sensitive or skillfully, but give that
 24 flexibility, that if somebody wants to do a
 25 smaller envelope, but a little bit taller, I

Page 30

1 height, but I strongly feel that this should be
 2 a number, 200 feet, and I know that they can
 3 make this project work with 200 feet. This
 4 205.5 frankly is driving me nuts, but, you
 5 know, I might be the only one.
 6 Because I see this in Codes all of the time
 7 and it's like total reverse political urban
 8 planning or whatever, you know, it is. So
 9 that's one question that we can debate or put
 10 to death.
 11 The other one is what Robert mentioned, if
 12 this project is of height -- what is the
 13 maximum stories that you can put under this
 14 Zoning classification or a PAD? Is it 20
 15 stories, is it 21, is it 17? I don't know if
 16 everybody knows that. I'm sorry if I'm
 17 ignorant about it, but I'd like to know,
 18 because I think there also has to be, to your
 19 point, a certain limit that people don't decide
 20 to somehow squeeze --
 21 MR. TRIAS: Possibly you could add a
 22 maximum number of stories as part of the
 23 recommendation that you make, which in this
 24 case probably be will be 18.
 25 MR. REVUELTA: How many stories does this

Page 32

1 would be comfortable with 20 stories and 200
 2 feet --
 3 MR. TRIAS: Right. That's --
 4 MR. REVUELTA: -- if you do X, Y and Z.
 5 MR. TORRE: You're the architects, right.
 6 You both would know if is this best. If you
 7 have the same FAR and you're not putting more
 8 floors, you do have to cram it. You have to
 9 squeeze it, right. So, as long as it looks
 10 right, is there a problem? I mean, I'm not
 11 saying --
 12 MR. TRIAS: But the issue is that the FAR
 13 really becomes 4.375. Really, that's what
 14 happens, because of a TDR. So it's a
 15 significant amount of FAR. If it was limited
 16 to 2, for example, it's different, which is not
 17 the case. I mean, the case is 3, 3.5, 4.375.
 18 MR. REVUELTA: Those are my comments.
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I agree with Venny,
 20 that I think the streetscape is very important,
 21 especially when you're taking such large areas
 22 and creating, from block to block, one building
 23 or one project. For example, in the last
 24 project that we saw, there were some elements
 25 to the ground floor that created a nice

1 division, that created sort of like a
 2 streetscape.
 3 MR. TRIAS: Sure.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And I like that, but
 5 there were a lot of people that were against
 6 that, didn't like that. It wasn't part of
 7 their way of looking at it.
 8 You know, I would leave it up to the Board
 9 of Architects as to whether it needs to be 20
 10 feet high for the Commercial and 10 feet or
 11 leave it up to the architects that are with us,
 12 but I do feel that it's important to do a
 13 streetscape, especially in a project of this
 14 magnitude, from the way it sounds. I think
 15 that's critical.
 16 You've got to see what you give to the
 17 public that walks by. And Venny gave a really
 18 little good example. I mean, it's not to pick
 19 on Mercedes or anything like that, but you want
 20 to have an element, and an element not only of
 21 design, but something that gives back to the
 22 neighborhood, whether it's an open space, it
 23 benefits the public also, and so forth. I
 24 mean, that would be something very nice.
 25 MR. TRIAS: No, absolutely, and like I

1 architects. Are there any recommendations,
 2 that you see, that we could make at this point
 3 with this project?
 4 MR. REVUELTA: I would make it maximum 200
 5 feet, maximum 20 stories, and if Venny or
 6 anyone wants to add something about additional
 7 public benefits to the --
 8 MS. MIRO: Streetscape?
 9 MR. REVUELTA: -- ground level, I'd be
 10 willing to --
 11 MR. TORRE: I'm not sure of the wording,
 12 brings forth exceptional ground level
 13 architecture and streetscape appeal? I don't
 14 know what the right term is, but --
 15 MR. TRIAS: I mean, if you think about the
 16 two streetscapes that we have that are nice,
 17 Miracle Mile, I would say, and Giralda, those
 18 were projects, those were not Zoning language.
 19 So there's a distinction or a range, from a
 20 project, to Zoning, and somewhere in between.
 21 Certainly we can have some more
 22 recommendations, but, I mean, at this point, 20
 23 stories, I think that would be too many, I
 24 mean, frankly.
 25 MR. BEHAR: I would agree. I

1 said, right now we have five percent in
 2 addition to the PAD of 20 percent. So that's
 3 one of the public benefits.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay.
 5 MR. TRIAS: Now, clearly this is not a
 6 solution for quality. Obviously, there's much
 7 more that could be here in the Code, but
 8 there's a point in which micromanaging through
 9 Zoning doesn't work, either. So, I mean, we
 10 need to find some balance.
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have two items.
 12 E-1 is legislative and E-2 is quasi-judicial.
 13 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. I mean, technically the
 14 Comp Plan is the one that we need a vote for
 15 real, whether it's positive or negative, one
 16 way or the other.
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Which would be,
 18 really, E-1, in this case.
 19 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 20 MS. MIRO: Mr. Chair, I have a question.
 21 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes, sir -- sorry,
 22 Claudia.
 23 MS. MIRO: It's okay.
 24 So Mr. Revuelta was talking about making
 25 some recommendations, since they are the

1 respectfully -- Luis, I think that 20 stories,
 2 you're going to --
 3 MR. REVUELTA: You want to make it 18?
 4 MR. BEHAR: I would cap it at 18 stories.
 5 That way I would -- if I want to give the
 6 incentive to have less units, bigger units,
 7 they need to be taller and that was the
 8 whole --
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That's the whole
 10 purpose.
 11 MS. MIRO: So 18 stories, how many feet?
 12 MR. BEHAR: I would do 18 stories. The 200
 13 feet, I mean, I'm okay with that, too. I don't
 14 know how everybody else feels. You know, 205
 15 feet 6 inches, obviously there is -- you
 16 know -- I'm okay with your recommendation of
 17 200 feet, but I would cap it at 18 stories.
 18 MR. REVUELTA: I would be fine with that.
 19 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, and in terms of process,
 20 this has to be sent to the State, so it takes a
 21 while for it to come back and go to Commission.
 22 So there's a chance to have any kind of
 23 conversation you may want to have.
 24 MR. REVUELTA: I have one last question.
 25 If the project applied for a PAD and is getting

Page 37

1 some benefits and giving something back, what's
 2 going to be the overall length that they can
 3 develop the tower?
 4 MR. TRIAS: Right. We don't have that
 5 level of detail in the Code, as you know, and
 6 other Codes do. I mean, that's something that
 7 Staff has been working on some ideas, because
 8 of your idea, your leadership in this, but, I
 9 think, at some point, that would be very
 10 helpful, to have a maximum increment. That's
 11 why many of the European cities we like so
 12 much, it's because they have a lot of
 13 relatively small buildings. I mean, they may
 14 be tall, but they're not big, in terms of the
 15 floor plate, and then that's what gives a lot
 16 of the quality of the architecture.
 17 MR. REVUELTA: As much as I said that I
 18 have a problem with the way that length was
 19 determined by another municipality in town, I
 20 think that, even the fact that the Gables has
 21 no limit, I think there's got to be a middle
 22 point somewhere, where you can break up
 23 building mass lengths, that would be good. No,
 24 I don't want to stir the pot here, throw a
 25 monkey wrench in the whole process here, but I

Page 39

1 that basically needs to be the size that it
 2 needs to be, given the current Zoning
 3 regulations, and that's understandable, but
 4 then the tower that goes on top of it, that
 5 doesn't necessarily need to be the same length
 6 as the pedestal, that's where I think the
 7 overmassing begins to create problems for
 8 architects, neighbors and Board Members.
 9 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 10 MR. TORRE: I disagree, in this sense, that
 11 what you're talking about, the parking
 12 pedestal, is what's on the ground floor and
 13 it's what you perceive the most.
 14 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. And that is not what
 15 this project is, and maybe I should be more
 16 clear. Even though the project, yeah, it takes
 17 the whole site, some of it is parking, some of
 18 it is courtyard, open space, some of it is
 19 arcade. There's a variety of things --
 20 MR. BEHAR: Correct. This has a
 21 freestanding garage, right?
 22 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. So what happens is that
 23 the actual building -- again, I'm just using it
 24 for illustration, because they're going to have
 25 it -- it's already a public record and it's

Page 38

1 think it's -- I think we should talk about it
 2 every once in a while --
 3 MR. TORRE: I think it's called out on
 4 Section 5.100, that 150 feet, have to have a
 5 break. This is on the --
 6 MR. TRIAS: In the facade, yes, but then
 7 the building could continue to be, yes. So
 8 we're talking about an architectural
 9 articulation more than different massing.
 10 MR. REVUELTA: But this building,
 11 essentially, could go from street to street.
 12 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 13 MR. REVUELTA: In terms of --
 14 MR. BEHAR: It could.
 15 MR. TRIAS: You'll see it next week.
 16 MR. TORRE: You guys know this better than
 17 anybody else, what's driving that is the
 18 parking. You have to have a parking garage big
 19 enough to make it worth to build a parking
 20 garage, plus then you have multiple elevator
 21 cores and multiple stairs. So the issue of the
 22 large building is to be able to --
 23 MR. REVUELTA: No, I understand that, but
 24 what happens in many municipalities and
 25 project, is that you have a parking pedestal

Page 40

1 been submitted, so the building actually goes
 2 all of the way to the ground, which is nice. I
 3 mean, if you have the ability -- that may be
 4 the answer to your question.
 5 The PAD, in those cases, allows for parking
 6 to be here and the building actually be on the
 7 other end of the design, all of the way to the
 8 ground, for example, which is, I think, a good
 9 thing.
 10 MR. WITHERS: I understand.
 11 MR. REVUELTA: And that's a good thing.
 12 That is a good thing.
 13 MR. TRIAS: Every time we've been able to
 14 do that, which has been a couple of times, I
 15 mean, or more than that, actually, the results
 16 are very good, because you end up with a
 17 building that has no pedestal, and that, to me,
 18 is the difference between, let's say, Coral
 19 Gables and Brickell, for example.
 20 MR. BEHAR: But it depends at what cost
 21 it's a good thing, because if you have a blocky
 22 six-story parking garage by itself, it may not
 23 be a good thing either.
 24 MR. TRIAS: No. It has to be designed
 25 properly, obviously.

1 MR. BEHAR: I mean, you really -- it's all
 2 contextually how it's done correctly.
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Would anybody like to
 4 make a motion?
 5 MR. TORRE: I'll make it. We have a couple
 6 of recommendations that I want to make sure we
 7 either agree, disagree on. You had a 200 --
 8 both of you guys had a 200-foot cap and an
 9 18-floor max.
 10 MR. REVUELTA: Correct.
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I don't know if Robert
 12 -- Robert, did you have a 200 or --
 13 MR. BEHAR: No. I was just following Luis.
 14 I don't have a problem with either/or. 18
 15 stories would be my recommendation.
 16 MS. MIRO: Do you we have to go as high as
 17 200? Can we go lower?
 18 MR. BEHAR: My opinion, if you are going to
 19 do bigger units and you're going to do 18
 20 stories, I think just mathematically you could
 21 say, okay, the ground floor will be 20 feet,
 22 you know, each floor after that is a little bit
 23 over -- like 11 feet. You know, that will be
 24 appropriate. I think that's the intent.
 25 So I think 200 would be the minimum to make

1 say.
 2 MR. COLLER: But just to understand your
 3 role in the Comp Plan, you're designated as the
 4 LPA, and so in order to either yay or nay on
 5 this, in order to move forward, they need a
 6 recommendation, one way or another, from the
 7 Land Planning Agency, which is you. So that's
 8 why this -- we advised in the last vote that we
 9 needed a recommendation. So that's kind of
 10 where we are with this.
 11 MR. TORRE: But does that Land Comp Plan
 12 change depend on a yes vote?
 13 MR. COLLER: No. You can have a no vote.
 14 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, that's fine.
 15 MR. COLLER: As long as you have a
 16 recommendation, whether it's yes or no, it
 17 doesn't matter, just as long as you have a
 18 recommendation from the LPA, which is what
 19 you're sitting as for the Comp Plan amendment.
 20 The second item, you can choose to wind up
 21 with a recommendation or you could choose --
 22 let's say we're a tied vote, that's okay, but
 23 it's really the first item that is where we
 24 need a recommendation, in order for it to go
 25 forward, one way or the other.

1 it quality spaces inside, because it's not like
 2 you have -- in this particular project, you
 3 don't have a podium parking, then the building
 4 on top. You've got 18 stories or whatever, and
 5 a detached garage. So, I mean --
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Remember we are not
 7 looking at --
 8 MR. TRIAS: It's attached to the building,
 9 but it's on a different part of the site.
 10 MR. BEHAR: But it's not underneath the
 11 building.
 12 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 13 MR. BEHAR: It's next to it.
 14 MR. TRIAS: Right.
 15 MR. TORRE: Now, these are just
 16 recommendations. The Commission can just, you
 17 know, do it the way --
 18 MR. REVUELTA: They're going to do whatever
 19 they want.
 20 MR. TRIAS: Well, like I said, this has to
 21 be sent to the State for a comment.
 22 MR. TORRE: Correct.
 23 MR. TRIAS: And they will tell us. What I
 24 anticipate is that they'll say it's a good idea
 25 to limit density. That's probably what they'll

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Robert, do you want to
 2 make the recommendation?
 3 Luis?
 4 MR. REVUELTA: Yes, I'll make a
 5 recommendation.
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Go ahead, please.
 7 MR. COLLER: This is going to be a motion;
 8 is that correct?
 9 MR. REVUELTA: Well, I make the motion to
 10 approve the item, with the Staff
 11 recommendation, and with the two
 12 recommendations of capping the building at 200
 13 feet and no more than 18 stories.
 14 MR. COLLER: So it's really a motion to
 15 approve, on a modified basis, from the
 16 Department recommendation, which is a maximum
 17 18 stories and 200 feet?
 18 MR. BEHAR: Luis, before I vote, I want to
 19 say something else. If you -- I'm thinking, if
 20 you're going to do an 18-story building, and
 21 you're going to have 20 feet on the ground
 22 floor, and if I want to have --
 23 MR. REVUELTA: 11 feet?
 24 MR. BEHAR: -- 10-foot clear, right --
 25 MR. REVUELTA: You're going to have a slab

1 that is 10 or 11 inches, you're going to have
 2 218 high building.
 3 MR. BEHAR: No. No. No. If you do a post
 4 tension building, and we're talking, you know,
 5 architect here, 10.67 --
 6 (Simultaneous speaking.)
 7 MR. BEHAR: Post-tension slab eight inches,
 8 it gives me 181 feet 4 inches, plus 20 feet --
 9 MR. REVUELTA: That's 121 feet and 4 and a
 10 half inches.
 11 MR. BEHAR: No. No. No. No.
 12 MR. REVUELTA: I'm reading your calculator.
 13 MR. BEHAR: And I'm going to go slow, so
 14 you can read it slowly. 17 stories at 10
 15 point --
 16 MR. REVUELTA: No, 18.
 17 MR. BEHAR: No. No. Because the 18th
 18 floor is the ground floor. So if you 10.67,
 19 times 17, it's 181.
 20 MR. REVUELTA: Plus 20 feet.
 21 MR. BEHAR: It's 201.
 22 MR. REVUELTA: .39 inches --
 23 MR. BEHAR: Right. So I think 200 feet is
 24 not going to give you that 10-foot ceilings.
 25 MR. REVUELTA: Well, they could do the

1 ground level at 18 feet and that would not make
 2 a hell of a difference.
 3 MR. BEHAR: Oh, no, you're right, that
 4 could happen.
 5 MR. REVUELTA: And, again, if you guys want
 6 to vote for 205.5, you know what --
 7 MR. BEHAR: The motion has been made, 200
 8 feet, 18 stories. That's the motion. Anything
 9 else to that motion?
 10 MR. REVUELTA: I'd like some rationality in
 11 the Code, right, and sometimes you read these
 12 Codes, that are totally arbitrary, and this is
 13 just -- coming up with those numbers is reverse
 14 engineering, specifically to this project, that
 15 when you're making Code changes, I believe they
 16 should be generic to the City, to the
 17 municipality and to other properties and to
 18 other projects.
 19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But let me ask you a
 20 question, if you're looking at a building
 21 that's 200 feet or you're looking at a building
 22 that's five-foot bigger or three-foot bigger,
 23 do you see a difference at all?
 24 MR. REVUELTA: No, zero. As a matter of
 25 fact, urbanists will tell you that the most

1 important part of the building is the first 50
 2 feet. After that, you know, it could be 180
 3 feet, that you will not able to --
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So if that's the
 5 case -- I'm not an architect, but if that's the
 6 case, and you cap it at 200, aren't you
 7 sacrificing on the design of the project by
 8 doing that?
 9 MR. REVUELTA: As an architect, I can tell
 10 you, absolutely not, but if you guys are
 11 comfortable with 205.5, go at it. I'll vote
 12 yes.
 13 MR. TORRE: Is there a motion on the table?
 14 MR. REVUELTA: Yeah, I made a motion with
 15 those two recommendations, 200 feet max, 18
 16 stories, and staff recommendations. Now, if
 17 you guys --
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So we have a motion.
 19 Is there a second?
 20 MS. MIRO: No, but I wanted to ask a
 21 question. I thought -- Venny, didn't you have
 22 a recommendation, as well, for how the
 23 streetscape --
 24 MR. TORRE: Well, let's see if this gets a
 25 second --

1 MR. REVUELTA: No, I'm finished.
 2 MR. TORRE: If it goes forward or not --
 3 MR. REVUELTA: If you want to add to that
 4 recommendation your concerns --
 5 MR. TRIAS: Mr. Revuelta, what I would
 6 propose is that 200 is equally arbitrary as
 7 205. There's no real distinction, in terms of
 8 whether it's arbitrary or not.
 9 MR. REVUELTA: As we are two Spaniards, we
 10 would -- I would rest. It's okay. Frankly, I
 11 don't want to make a big deal about it. I
 12 already did, so it's whatever you guys want.
 13 MR. TORRE: I'll make a motion. So the
 14 motion is 205.5 --
 15 MR. BEHAR: The motion is 200.
 16 MR. TORRE: No. I'm making a different
 17 one. I'm waiting for a second, otherwise I'll
 18 make one. Is there going to be a second?
 19 MR. BEHAR: I'll second it.
 20 MS. MIRO: Now I'm not sure what it is that
 21 the motion is. Can you please make it -- is it
 22 200 or 205?
 23 MR. BEHAR: 200.
 24 MR. TRIAS: It's 200.
 25 MS. MIRO: 18 stories?

1 MR. TORRE: Before we all vote, so what I
2 was going to ask was to change it to 205.5,
3 based on the point that you are not going to
4 notice, to improve the ground floor amenities
5 to the highest degree, and cap it at 18
6 stories.

7 MR. BEHAR: So --

8 MR. TORRE: The 18 stands. The 205, I
9 think, is irrelevant. I think, at the end of
10 the day, more important to me is what happens
11 on the first three floors, first, second and --

12 MR. BEHAR: See, let me tell you what --
13 and we're going to -- you know, that's the
14 motion and we're going to -- to me, it's more
15 important how the relationship of that building
16 is to the sidewalk; that you're going to have a
17 big building on a five-foot sidewalk. To me,
18 that's the biggest concern. Maybe that should
19 be pulled back further --

20 MR. TORRE: I think that's all part of the
21 same I'm trying to make. I think what happens
22 on the ground floor, whether it's a setback,
23 whether it's a great 10, 15 feet of space --

24 MR. BEHAR: But if you give an arcade --
25 you know, they're proposing a 12-foot arcade,

1 but at the end of the day, that -- and we see
2 some example right here on LeJeune Road, where
3 the building is right up to the property line.

4 MR. TRIAS: Not anymore, because now you
5 have to set back 10 feet from Le Jeune.

6 MR. BEHAR: That's my concern. That's
7 where you give the public benefits, where the
8 building's -- you know, you have some relief.
9 To me, those are more beneficial urbanistically
10 than -- the additional five feet, you're
11 absolutely right, 200 or 205 feet, nobody is
12 going to see that.

13 MR. TORRE: See, the thing is that the
14 approval of all of these projects is
15 subjective. So one person's green space is
16 another person's setback is another person's
17 colonnade. All of these things are somewhat,
18 you know, subjective.

19 I think, overall speaking, that the intent
20 of the streetscape, that's a very generic
21 statement. I'm not trying to tell you how to
22 do it. I'm just saying, we should be watchful.
23 We should be cognizant of what happens on the
24 ground floor, as a general rule, and that
25 should be the law of the land.

1 In other words, we should be focusing on
2 the ground floor and not --

3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there a way to add
4 a recommendation as to what happens on the
5 ground floor?

6 MR. REVUELTA: I don't see any -- the
7 market is going to dictate who leases those
8 spaces, right. So as much as I agree with him,
9 you cannot control the supply and demand. So
10 whether you get a restaurant or a bicycle --
11 who knows -- I think it's a matter of, as what
12 Robert was saying, what are the setbacks. I
13 happen to believe that the arcade is an
14 environmentally friendly architectural device
15 that works. I don't know if -- 12 feet seems
16 like a big arcade, I mean, but I don't know how
17 to address that, other than the fact that when
18 you have big building masses, somehow,
19 architecturally, they need to be broken up a
20 little bit, without sacrificing the project's
21 success.

22 MR. TORRE: Here's the question, shouldn't
23 we be proposing or asking the Board of
24 Architects to start taking a closer look at
25 what happens on the ground floor, as a general

1 rule? And, again, I'm not suggesting that one
2 rule is the next rule is the next. It's just a
3 proposal that this is what should be guiding
4 the approvals.

5 MR. BEHAR: I'm not sure that's the Board
6 of Architects, because every project is
7 different.

8 MR. TORRE: They're all subjective.

9 MR. BEHAR: Yeah. You know, I'm not
10 sure --

11 MR. TORRE: It's all -- there's no specific
12 rule here that says, this is what you must do.
13 It's all subjective.

14 MR. BEHAR: Look, for example, if you have
15 a retail on Miracle Mile -- let's not use
16 Miracle Mile -- on Ponce or something, an
17 arcade is not always a good thing to do,
18 because the retail spaces suffer when you have
19 an arcade.

20 MR. TORRE: But the Code says that's not
21 allowed. It's already in the Code. It's says
22 that you're not supposed to do it.

23 MR. BEHAR: You know --

24 MR. TORRE: That one specifically is
25 blocked.

1 MR. BEHAR: Every project is different. I
2 don't know if -- and Ramon, you could, you
3 know, maybe confirm this or not, you know, the
4 Board of Architects, to give them prescribed
5 direction, I don't know if that's a good thing
6 to do.

7 MR. TRIAS: Look, we've been talking about
8 this for a long time recently, and the bottom
9 line is that you need to have flexibility,
10 otherwise you do not get quality. I mean, the
11 easiest thing to do is to have design
12 guidelines that I can check, check, check,
13 check, we're done. Does that give you a
14 beautify city? No. No. And I don't want to
15 mention some of the cities that do that, in
16 other counties, and so on, where I have worked,
17 but frankly that's not Coral Gables.

18 Coral Gables is very professional, it
19 expects a lot of expertise. That's why we have
20 all of the Boards and things. And even then,
21 the citizens have an opportunity to give their
22 opinions and explain how everybody is doing a
23 bad job. So all of that eventually leads to
24 quality, I think, you know, eventually. It's
25 just that that's the way the process is.

1 To think that you can micromanage that at
2 the Zoning Code level is not realistic.

3 MR. BEHAR: Yeah.

4 Could I make a friendly amendment to your
5 motion, that we do go with the 205 feet 6
6 inches, cap it at the 18 stories and follow the
7 Planning Department's recommendation?

8 MR. REVUELTA: One quick question. Is
9 there a minimum or a maximum depth of an arcade
10 in the Code? Does it have to be a minimum of 3
11 feet, 5 feet and no more than 15, 12? I'm
12 sorry for my --

13 MR. TRIAS: We use a 12-foot ideal
14 standard, if we can.

15 MR. REVUELTA: As a maximum?

16 MR. TRIAS: Yeah -- well, as a standard.

17 MR. BEHAR: As a standard.

18 MR. REVUELTA: But if somebody says, like
19 Robert is saying --

20 MR. TRIAS: Robert never does six-foot
21 arcades, okay, and I want to say that clearly.
22 You've always done very nice wide arcades,
23 properly.

24 MR. BEHAR: Thank you. Repeat that again
25 one more time.

1 MR. TRIAS: Robert has always done arcades
2 that are about 12-feet wide, which is the ideal
3 dimension. Some architects have tried to do
4 less than the --

5 MR. REVUELTA: But he was bringing up a
6 good point, that if you're going to do retail,
7 you don't want the retail -- if it's a
8 restaurant, great, because you can have outside
9 seating, but if it's --

10 MR. TRIAS: For restaurants, it's great,
11 yes.

12 MR. REVUELTA: What I'm wondering and my
13 questions, is there a minimum -- in order to
14 get the bonuses, a minimum depth of an arcade?
15 Is it six feet or eight? Is there a number, I
16 guess, is the question?

17 MR. BEHAR: Six feet is not really --

18 MR. REVUELTA: No, I'm not suggesting six
19 feet. I'm asking if there is in the Code
20 something.

21 MR. BEHAR: There used to be something. I
22 remember, years ago, something, you know,
23 limiting the minimum you could do, for that
24 particular reason.

25 MR. TRIAS: Yeah. No, that's a big issue,

1 for obvious reasons. My only advice is that
2 we're here to deal with a very specific issue.
3 We're not here to brainstorm today, brainstorm
4 about many things that we can do in the Code.
5 We can do many things in the Code. We spent
6 three years working on that, and we were able
7 to implement some things, and at the same time,
8 we also were not able to do many other things.

9 So I don't think it's a good use of our
10 time right now, but if you want to have a
11 structural way to deal with those ideas, we
12 could do that, certainly.

13 MR. REVUELTA: I was just asking a
14 question.

15 MR. BEHAR: So we did -- we had a motion.
16 I suggested -- I recommended a friendly
17 amendment to that motion of going up to the 205
18 feet --

19 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: The way it's written.

20 MR. BEHAR: The way it's written, limiting
21 it only to 18 stories, and not as the maker of
22 the motion, but as the second, I welcome any
23 other input into it.

24 MR. COLLIER: Just one question, just so I
25 know where we are in the motion. Have we

1 gotten an agreement from the person whose made
 2 the motion to the 205?
 3 MR. BEHAR: Not yet.
 4 MR. REVUELTA: Let me tell you, I'll
 5 withdraw my motion. Let me make it easier,
 6 I'll withdraw the motion, okay.
 7 MR. COLLER: Okay. So now we have no
 8 motion on the floor at this time.
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So we have no motion.
 10 MR. BEHAR: So I'm going to make a motion
 11 to approve with the 205 feet 6 inches, capping
 12 it at 18 stories, and with all of the Staff
 13 recommendation, and I'll welcome if there's any
 14 friendly amendment that wants to be put in.
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Let me ask you a
 16 question, Robert. Can this height increase
 17 with bonuses of any type or can the 18 stories
 18 increase with any bonuses of any type?
 19 MR. TRIAS: The Mediterranean Level II
 20 would be required. That's one of the
 21 requirements. So it cannot be increased beyond
 22 that, but you do have to meet the requirements.
 23 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: But you have to meet
 24 those requirements?
 25 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

1 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, 205.5 -- I mean, 6
 2 inches, and 18 stories is the new --
 3 MR. WITHERS: We haven't even talked about
 4 Mezzanines or amenity floors or anything in
 5 that --
 6 MR. TRIAS: That's separate in the Code,
 7 yes.
 8 MR. COLLER: So, at this point, we have a
 9 motion, but we don't have a second.
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: That is correct.
 11 MR. WITHERS: I will second the motion.
 12 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Chip second the
 13 motion. Any discussion?
 14 MS. MIRO: I just wanted to ask, whatever
 15 happened with the ground floor recommendations
 16 about the streetscape that we were discussing?
 17 Is that out the window or do we still want to
 18 -- and I know we asked the City Attorney if
 19 there was a way that we can do that. I guess
 20 I'm just not sure, if we say maximum -- what
 21 was the word that you used, Venny?
 22 MR. TORRE: Excellent.
 23 MS. MIRO: Excellent architectural
 24 streetscape --
 25 MR. TORRE: Yeah. There is not an easy way

1 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: I just want to be
 2 clear on that.
 3 MR. BEHAR: On Level II Med Bonus.
 4 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: On Level II, okay.
 5 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Okay. We have a
 7 motion by Robert. Anybody want to make a
 8 second?
 9 MR. TORRE: I'm going to say that we won,
 10 the discussion was had. We had an hour of this
 11 discussion. These things matter. These
 12 discussions do go a long way, and I believe
 13 people listen, so I believe that we win by
 14 doing this. And if it doesn't carry forward, I
 15 still think there's a lot to be gained from
 16 what we discussed here. So I'll leave it as
 17 is, but I think we did discuss what I believe
 18 was important and I'll leave it at that.
 19 MR. BEHAR: Are you seconding --
 20 MR. TORRE: I'm not making a motion -- I
 21 mean, I'm not seconding it.
 22 MR. WITHERS: So what is the motion, 205.5
 23 feet, with 18 stories, that's basically --
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: 205.6, if I'm not
 25 mistaken --

1 to describe it, but we're trying to achieve a
 2 better streetscape. I'm not sure how that's
 3 described.
 4 MR. WITHERS: And we'll see next week what
 5 it looks like, I guess.
 6 MR. COLLER: Well, first, as you know,
 7 we're not dealing with a specific project here.
 8 So this is being written -- it's difficult,
 9 with the term excellent, because -- the problem
 10 with the Zoning Code is, there needs to be
 11 certain concrete terms. Compatibility is an
 12 acceptable term, actually, in Zoning, but to
 13 say, Excellent, is just -- beyond having a
 14 definition to it --
 15 MR. BEHAR: Look, let's not kid ourselves.
 16 This project is coming next week. This is
 17 specifically written for that project. That's
 18 it.
 19 MR. COLLER: Yes, but it does apply, and
 20 the point I'm making is, it's no secret that
 21 this applies to any project within this area.
 22 There may never be another project.
 23 MR. BEHAR: There's a motion and a second.
 24 MS. MIRO: I was just going to say, I would
 25 feel more comfortable if we had that added on,

1 but I don't know what the wording is,
 2 Mr. Attorney, for some kind of streetscape --
 3 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You'd have to ask the
 4 gentleman --
 5 MR. BEHAR: I said, on the record, I
 6 welcome any friendly amendment to that motion.
 7 MS. MIRO: I'm just not sure what the
 8 wording is. I'd be happy to make that friendly
 9 amendment -- suggest it.
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there a way to word
 11 it, what Claudia --
 12 MR. COLLER: I'll yield to the Planning
 13 Director.
 14 MR. TRIAS: I don't know why they ask the
 15 attorney to come up with the language, as they
 16 don't practice this line of work. What happens
 17 is, like I said, we have two ways of doing
 18 this. We can have very prescriptive language,
 19 meaning every sidewalk will have a bulb out,
 20 every "X" number of feet to plant a shade tree
 21 that is at least this size, et cetera, et
 22 cetera. We can have something like that, and
 23 we do have some of that language already in the
 24 Landscape Code, et cetera. There's some
 25 minimum standards and so on, materials. We can

1 for.
 2 MR. COLLER: So I just want to make one
 3 comment. Because a PAD is a Conditional Use,
 4 and when you get PADs, you get the opportunity
 5 to evaluate them, specifically what they have
 6 designed for the first floor, you will be able
 7 to look at that and make a judgment whether you
 8 feel that, in fact, the PAD has accomplished --
 9 MR. TRIAS: And you're not the first ones
 10 to look at it. I mean, because when things are
 11 said like this, it appears that everything
 12 comes to you for the first time. No. No. No.
 13 There's DRC. There's months -- I mean,
 14 Mr. Behar knows how many months it takes
 15 sometimes to deal with these issues. All of
 16 that is done prior to you being able to take a
 17 look at it.
 18 So I think that's part of the process
 19 already, but certainly we can come up with some
 20 additional language if you --
 21 MR. BEHAR: Claudia, I'm not sure that we
 22 really have a tool, a mechanism, to do that. I
 23 think, and Ramon is correct, that goes through
 24 a process, an evolution, that I think is --
 25 there's enough check points where that could be

1 have that.
 2 We can have some aspirational language,
 3 like Mr. Torre was talking about, in terms of,
 4 you know, we'll try to come up with a more
 5 compatible design, that incorporates the
 6 sidewalk and the private areas, et cetera. We
 7 can say all that and we can come up with some
 8 language, but that is being done right now. I
 9 mean, I've been working here for ten years
 10 trying to make this City as beautiful as I can,
 11 and I get very frustrated by the lack of
 12 appreciation that goes on for the process.
 13 There's a lot of people that work very hard to
 14 do all of that. I mean, every time we have
 15 this discussion, it appears that, oh, anybody's
 16 ever thought about that, like, oh, you know, a
 17 sidewalk, how do you -- we spend hours working
 18 on those things.
 19 Now, is there a way to have a Code that
 20 explains that better, possibly, but we will
 21 need to think about it a little bit and we can
 22 come up with some language, maybe for a future
 23 meeting, but right now, to add a couple of
 24 words, that are aspirational, I don't know if
 25 that's going to accomplish what we're looking

1 looked at.
 2 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And, also, a project
 3 would have to come before us, so we can make
 4 some recommendations based on that Site Plan
 5 that comes before us or that project that comes
 6 before us.
 7 MR. TRIAS: Absolutely.
 8 MR. BEHAR: All PADs have to come through
 9 here.
 10 MR. TRIAS: And that's the way it's done
 11 typically. We could come up with a more
 12 prescriptive process, but I'm not sure that's
 13 going to result in better projects.
 14 MR. BEHAR: No. And to Luis' point, when
 15 you start doing that, you start, you know,
 16 making the project more --
 17 MS. MIRO: I understand.
 18 MR. TORRE: I just came up with a word. I
 19 mean, I know what you guys have said. Focuses
 20 on the improvement of the public realm or
 21 provides more focus. And I'm reading what the
 22 PAD is supposed to do already. The PAD, by
 23 itself, encourages broader development, public
 24 benefits and promotes compatibility with the
 25 architectural and urban design characteristics

1 surrounding the area. So that's kind of doing
 2 some of it.
 3 But in terms of focusing on the improvement
 4 of the immediate public realm, I'm not sure,
 5 can a sentence of aspiration --
 6 MR. TRIAS: I think an amendment of the
 7 Code that describes the PAD intent, that's a
 8 very good place to do it, to explain it.
 9 MR. TORRE: All I'm trying to do is bring
 10 focus to this issue. Again, we live with these
 11 pedestals, we live with these garages, and they
 12 get built and the little buildings come down
 13 and we lose the fabric of the City, and all I'm
 14 saying is, let's do that, but with an intent
 15 and not lose it completely. Let's focus on
 16 what happens as you walk down these streets.
 17 MR. TRIAS: I think, a recommendation to
 18 enhance the intent of the language that deals
 19 with the intent of the PAD and focuses toward
 20 public space may be a way to do this.
 21 MS. MIRO: I understand the comments that
 22 you made, Mr. Trias, and also my colleagues,
 23 Mr. Behar, and I will echo what Mr. Torre said,
 24 that I appreciate the fact that we're having
 25 these conversations and that we're being

1 THE SECRETARY: Claudia Miro?
 2 MS. MIRO: Yes.
 3 THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?
 4 MR. REVUELTA: Yes.
 5 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 7 THE SECRETARY: We need a motion for E-2.
 8 MR. TRIAS: We have the second --
 9 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have to do E-2.
 10 MR. COLLER: And I might suggest a similar
 11 amendment, I think, is the intent for E-2, as
 12 well, or do we need them for E-2?
 13 MR. TRIAS: E-2 is really where we will do
 14 the amendments, because of the Zoning Code, as
 15 far as the aspirational language, I think
 16 that's a more appropriate place.
 17 MR. COLLER: Well, I'm not sure that the
 18 language in E-2 is -- the title is expansive
 19 enough that it would apply to all PADs. It's
 20 something we would have to look at. I think
 21 the important thing is, what the Board is
 22 saying is some general language, with regard to
 23 what we've discussed, to be included in all
 24 PADs, not just necessarily related to these
 25 PADs.

1 vigilant and that we're bringing these things
 2 to the surface. I also echo the sentiment of
 3 maybe adding that one liner. I think it would
 4 make me feel better, that we're trying to make
 5 sure that we're in deed keeping and making the
 6 City beautiful.
 7 MR. TRIAS: I think that's the easiest and
 8 most effective way, to edit the intent language
 9 in the Code. I think that's a very good idea.
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So, Mr. Behar, would
 11 you add that?
 12 MR. BEHAR: I'm going to withdraw my
 13 motion -- whatever the Board feels, I'm okay
 14 with it.
 15 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: And --
 16 MR. WITHERS: Yes, I'll accept it.
 17 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: You'll accept it. Any
 18 other discussion? No?
 19 Call the roll, please.
 20 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 21 MR. TORRE: Yes.
 22 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
 23 MR. WITHERS: Yes.
 24 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 25 MR. BEHAR: Yes.

1 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, which my thinking is,
 2 that means an amendment to the PAD language in
 3 the Zoning Code.
 4 MR. COLLER: Exactly.
 5 MR. TRIAS: That's what that means.
 6 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So your suggestion is
 7 to parallel it or not?
 8 MR. COLLER: Yes, but they probably will
 9 not be able to act on your -- that language on
 10 this item, because of the narrow scope of this
 11 item, but it gives to the City Commission, that
 12 consider an amendment to all PADs with regard
 13 to the focus on the first floor --
 14 MR. TORRE: Public realm.
 15 MR. COLLER: -- public realm focus.
 16 MR. BEHAR: I like that.
 17 MR. TRIAS: Yeah, we could come back with
 18 some language that deals with the Zoning intent
 19 of the PAD that addresses some of those issues.
 20 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: So how do we resolve,
 21 then, E-2?
 22 MR. COLLER: E-2, I think, is the same
 23 amendments, right --
 24 MR. TRIAS: Yes.
 25 MR. COLLER: -- 18 stories and the

1 requested feet, with the recommendation of
 2 consideration of the focus on the public realm
 3 in the general PAD Ordinance.
 4 MR. TRIAS: Yeah.
 5 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Is there a motion?
 6 MS. MIRO: I'll make a motion.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: We have a motion. Is
 8 there a second?
 9 MR. TORRE: I'll second it.
 10 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Venny second it. Any
 11 discussion?
 12 Call the roll, please.
 13 THE SECRETARY: Chip Withers?
 14 MR. WITHERS: Yes.
 15 THE SECRETARY: Robert Behar?
 16 MR. BEHAR: Yes.
 17 THE SECRETARY: Claudia Miro?
 18 MS. MIRO: Yes.
 19 THE SECRETARY: Luis Revuelta?
 20 MR. REVUELTA: Yes.
 21 THE SECRETARY: Venny Torre?
 22 MR. TORRE: Yes.
 23 THE SECRETARY: Eibi Aizenstat?
 24 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Yes.
 25 The next item, which is the New Business,

1 get the project approved or denied.
 2 Those are the two changes. After
 3 significant discussion, I think the conclusion
 4 was that these were appropriate and that they
 5 enhance the Ordinance. Staff recommends
 6 approval.
 7 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Do we have any --
 8 before we proceed, do we have any speakers for
 9 this item, Jill?
 10 THE SECRETARY: Not on Zoom.
 11 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Not on Zoom.
 12 Anybody here that would like to speak on
 13 this item? No?
 14 At this time, I'll go ahead and close the
 15 floor, and open it up for discussion.
 16 MR. TORRE: I do have a few questions,
 17 first for Staff, just to clarify.
 18 CHAIRMAN AIZENSTAT: Sure.
 19 MR. TORRE: My understanding is that
 20 Section 5-100 and beyond has two level of
 21 bonus, which basically this is what it's
 22 getting to, the meat of the bonuses. One is
 23 the Level I bonus and one is the Level II
 24 bonus.
 25 MR. TRIAS: Yes.

1 is E-3.
 2 MR. COLLER: Okay. Item E-3, an Ordinance
 3 of the City of Commission of Coral Gables,
 4 Florida, providing for text amendments to the
 5 City of Coral Gables Official Zoning Code,
 6 Article 5, "Architecture," Section 5-200,
 7 "Mediterranean Standards," to limit the
 8 Mediterranean Bonus program to Coral Gables
 9 Mediterranean Architectural Style and expand
 10 the Board of Architects review process to
 11 include an optional conceptual review;
 12 providing for severability, repealer,
 13 codification, and for an effective date.
 14 Item E-3, public hearing.
 15 MR. TRIAS: So, Mr. Chairman, there are two
 16 changes. One deals with the word, Coral Gables
 17 Mediterranean Style, which remains, and "Other
 18 Styles," is eliminated in certain areas. So
 19 it's a more targeted Ordinance towards Coral
 20 Gables Mediterranean style.
 21 The second important aspect of this is the
 22 creation of an optional conceptual review
 23 process, meaning somebody could go to the Board
 24 and have a more informal discussion and
 25 hopefully benefit from that, without having to

1 MR. TORRE: This is applying to a Level I
 2 bonus. The Level II bonus already has
 3 Mediterranean requirements. Is that factual?
 4 I think the biggest change will be a Level I,
 5 which before didn't have such a strict
 6 Mediterranean requirement.
 7 Right. So we're getting to -- the FAR
 8 increases to 3.2 with this level, and it gets
 9 to 3.5 when you get to Level II; is that
 10 correct?
 11 MR. TRIAS: That's correct, yes.
 12 MR. TORRE: Okay. And the big buildings,
 13 which have caused the majority of the issues
 14 that I think are causing this to come forth,
 15 are the ones that hit Level V -- I'm sorry,
 16 Level II, not Level V -- am I going to the
 17 right place?
 18 MR. TRIAS: Yes. Yes. And I think there
 19 was only one Level I in recent memory.
 20 MR. TORRE: Right. So when was the last
 21 time a Level I was proposed?
 22 MR. TRIAS: I think, when Robert Behar
 23 worked on that -- when was that, five years ago
 24 or something -- I mean, some time ago.
 25 MR. TORRE: Right.